

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **April 7, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-30** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-5, 9-20 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani et al. (US 2001/0034747).

Claims 6-8 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujitani et al. in view of Okigami (US 6,788,427).

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, and claim 4 has been canceled. Claim 1 now recites computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by processors, causes the processors to perform acts including receiving from a client computing device, a request to print an image on a remote printing device, wherein a printer driver for the printing is not installed on the client computing device, and applying print options identified by the request when printing the image, where the print options are automatically identified based at least in part on characteristics of the request.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 20010034747) (hereinafter “Fujitani”). Fujitani, however, does not disclose one or more print options being automatically identified based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the request, as required by amended claim 1. The office action identifies page 3, paragraph [0039] of Fujitani as disclosing such. Fujitani, however, discloses that “in printing the user selected information, the control unit 111 accesses the data stored in the disk

120 and the data includes user profile information as well as printer profile information for limiting certain print activities.” (See paragraph [0039]). This is not equivalent to the print options being automatically identified based at least on part on the characteristics of the request. The control unit 111 of Fujitani does not identify the characteristics of the request. It is identifying the user profile, the printer profile, and printing limitations, which are not part of a request as claimed. As Fujitani does not identify the characteristics of the request, it cannot automatically identify print options based on the characteristics of the request.

Since claim 1 recites features not disclosed or suggested by Fujitani, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani. Accordingly, dependent **claims 2-3 and 5-10** also patentably distinguish over Fujitani and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to include the user-selected print options being automatically identified based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the request. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani. The argument above for claim 1 applies equally to claim 11. Therefore, since claim 11 recites features not disclosed or suggested by Fujitani, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani. Accordingly, dependent **claim 12** also patentably distinguishes over Fujitani and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 13

Claim 13 has been amended to include storing an indication of the print options selected in the sub-set for subsequent printing operations for a particular user. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani.

Fujitani, however, does not disclose storing an indication of the print options selected in the sub-set for subsequent printing options for a particular user. Fujitani, in paragraph [0037], discloses that “the control unit 211 prepares the selected information for printing and sends the selected information to the printer processing unit 11 through the use of RAM 116.” This is not equivalent to storing an indication of the print options selected in the sub-set for subsequent printing options for a particular user. There is no indication in Fujitani that a user’s selected print options are stored so that when he or she comes back to print, the system will have stored

an indication of the print options selected by that user. Therefore, since claim 13 recites features not taught or suggested by Fujitani, claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 14

Claim 14 has been amended to include the print options being automatically identified based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the request. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani. The explanation of Fujitani above as applied to claim 1 also applies to claim 14. Therefore, the Fujitani fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 14 and thus, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani.

Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 recites a method comprising receiving a print request identifying a document to be printed and automatically identifying, based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the print request, a set of print options to be used when printing the document. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani. Based on the previous explanation of Fujitani, Fujitani fails to teach or suggest the automatically identifying as recited in claim 15. Therefore, since claim 15 recites features not taught or suggested by Fujitani, claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani. Accordingly, dependent **claims 16-26** also patentably distinguish over Fujitani and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 27

Claim 27 recites a system comprising a web server allowing an imaging client to communicate a print request to a printer corresponding to the web server, and an auto-select module configured to automatically select one or more print options to be used when printing an image identified by the print request. Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujitani.

Fujitani, however, does not disclose an auto-select module configured to automatically select one or more print options to be used when printing an image identified by the print request. In paragraph [0038] of Fujitani, the Internet control unit 119 controls the connections

between the print processing unit the web server. Fujitani does not disclose the control unit 119 identifies the image of the print request. Fujitani does not disclose automatically selecting print options based upon the identification of the image to be printed from the web server. These features are recited by claim 27. Accordingly, claim 27 recites features not taught or suggested by Fujitani. Thus, claim 27 patentably distinguishes over Fujitani. Accordingly, dependent **claims 28-30** also patentably distinguish over Fujitani and are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claim Rejections

Claims 6-8 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujitani in view of Okigami. As claims 6-8 depend from claim 1 and claims 21-23 depend from claim 15, the arguments above apply equally to these claims. Accordingly, dependent claims 6-8 and 21-23 patentably distinguish over Fujitani in view of Okigami and are in condition for allowance.

The references cited but not applied have been considered and do not teach or suggest the recited features of the respective claims, individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-3 and 5-30** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

6- JULY - 2005



PETAR Kraguljac (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843